

## REMARKS

New independent method claim 51 and associated dependent method claims 52 to 58 have been added.

Claims 38; 40 to 44; 49; and 50 to 58 remain in the application.

New independent method claim 51 is patterned after independent method claim 38 (as amended in Amendment D), except that, in (iv) of new method claim 51, (iii) and (v) of claim 38 have been combined as part of the anchoring element. Element (ii) of new claim 51 (like (ii) of claim 38) recites: “first, introducing the intraluminal directing device separately from intraluminal fastener applier from a remote access site to a location within a prosthesis that has been deployed at a target site in an aorta where the diseased or damaged section exists, thereby establishing an access path.” Element (iii) of new claim 51 (like (iv) of claim 38) recites: “and then advancing the intraluminal fastener applier from the remote access site into the intraluminal directing device along the access path.” Element (v) of new claim 51 (like (vi) of claim 38) recites (after anchoring the prosthesis while applying a resolving force): “and then separating the intraluminal fastener applier from the intraluminal directing device by retrieving the intraluminal fastener applier from the intraluminal directing device along the access path back to the remote access site.” In these respects, new claim 51 (like claim 38) incorporates subject matter that is not taught or suggested by Taheri et al. (US 5,042,707), as was discussed during the interview conducted February 20, 2008 – namely, Taheri does not teach or suggest an intraluminal directing device defining an access path, and an intraluminal fastener applier separate from the intraluminal directing device that can be advanced into the directing device and, after anchoring the prosthesis while applying a resolving force to resolve at least a portion of the implantation force, separated from the directing device by retrieval from the directing device, as defined in new claim 51.

The new dependent claims 52 to 58 are patterned after dependent claims 40; 41; 42; 43; 44; 49; and 50, respectively.

In Amendment B (Response to Requirement for Species/Subspecies Election), Applicant stated that independent method claim 38 and its dependent claims 40 to 44 are generic to all species/subspecies. Applicant affirms this, and further states that new independent claim 51 and its new dependent claims 52 to 56 are likewise generic to all species and subspecies. Upon allowance of

at least one of these generic claim, Applicant seeks the opportunity to submit additional dependent claims directed to the species/subspecies.

For these reasons, applicant believes that Claims 38; 40 to 44; 49; and 50 to 58 are in condition for allowance. As expressed during the interview conducted February 20, 2008, if the Examiner believes that questions or matters of clarification remain, applicant believes that such matters can be handled expeditiously by an interview by telephone to advance prosecution of this case, and the applicant remains committed to proceed on that basis.

Respectfully Submitted,

By

Daniel D. Ryan

Registration No. 29,243

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.  
Post Office Box 26618  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226  
(262) 783 - 1300  
Customer No.: 26308